DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 996 HE 000 221

By-Heist, Paul

Intellect and Commitment: The Faces of Discontent.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Pub Date 65

Note-29p.; Edited version of article in Order and Freedom on the Campus, WICHE and Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1965.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.55

Descriptors-*Academic Achievement, *Higher Education, Individual Characteristics, *Intelligence Level, Personality Tests, Student Attitudes, *Student Characteristics, Student Leadership, *Student Organizations, Student Participation

An analysis of student protest movements on 3 separate campuses revealed that leaders of the movements were brighter than average, usually classified themselves as non-religious, but were morally concerned about social and political issues. Participants in the Free Speech Movement (FSM) at Berkeley were found to have similar characteristics, and Center researchers conducted a more detailed study on initiators of and participants in the movement. Three hypotheses were used to compare FSM students with non-participating or average students: (1) that FSM participants are better students, more autonomous, have broader intellectual dispositions and obtain higher GPAs, (2) that there is a larger percentage of transfer students in the FSM group, and (3) that the majority of transfer students come from selective liberal arts, private, and public institutions. Three student samples were surveyed: 188 FSM participants who had been arrested, 60 FSM volunteers, and a randomly selected group of non-participating seniors. Findings of the study supported the 3 hypotheses. The arrested and volunteer students represent an unusual group that possesses exceptional scholarship potential, and their concern about social problems and political issues is secondary to their educational goals. They felt a need to become involved in academic matters and to attempt to establish a relationship between their education and problems in the world. (WM)

ED025996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Center for the Study
of Higher Education
University of Calif.
Berkeley

INTELLECT AND COMMITMENT: THE FACES OF DISCONTENT*

Paul Heist

Since 1950 the college student in America has become a major subject for research. A number of investigations conducted during the decade following this date had their inception at a time when the mass of college youth were described as the "silent generation" and the "uncommitted majority." Several long-range studies of students were begun at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley during this period of relative quiescence. At the time student protest activity and spontaneous student involvement in non-academic matters did not represent more than a subsidiary research concern in the Center's studies. As the research progressed over the years, however, and especially after 1960, there was an observable increase in student activity of a "non-collegiate" nature in some of the student bodies being studied, as well as in a sampling of other institutions.

In view of the changes in the temper of student behavior, even though in a limited number of colleges and universities, the staff at the Berkeley Center became interested in the students and student groups who were being labeled as "activists" and who were giving leadership to developments which did not have their origin in the curriculum and the classroom. Largely as the result of

---

*This report on the Berkeley students who participated in the Free Speech Movement represents an edited version of an article in Order and Freedom on the Campus, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1965. The survey of students in the FSM was planned and conducted with the assistance of Adrienne Ross, research associate at the Center.

HE 000 221

some of our earlier findings, regarding important differences among students, we became particularly interested in the personality characteristics which might differentiate between men and women who were committing themselves to dealing with political issues and existing social problems and the majority of students who seemed to remain aloof from the "outside world".

During the past decade the realm of higher education itself also came under increasing attack from many fronts. And occasionally, small and somewhat isolated groups of students joined in this criticism, although the available evidence from a number of investigations before 1960 showed that the mass of students, at all levels of ability, seemed to be satisfied and amazingly complacent. When the thinking of men and women, in selected colleges, was sampled after 1960, the general situation had not changed very much. One still obtained a revealing picture of only a small minority of people who were critical of their educational experiences and often of other aspects of American society. These students, seemingly somewhat self-selected and more prominently represented in certain institutions, were readily recognized as an atypical sample of modern youth.

Thus, even at the beginning of the present decade, evaluative and critical analyses, whether of disturbing social and political phenomena or of the tradition-bound educational system, were forthcoming in very few colleges and universities. This fact represents a sad commentary on higher education and can be interpreted as an indictment of the basic interests and motivations of most faculty and students. What cracks were exposed in the ivoried and not infrequently fossilized towers of education during recent years seemed to result chiefly from the occasional efforts of a minimal number of students. The activities of committed minorities in scattered settings have generated concern, encouraged new perspectives and initiated some changes, both within

educational institutions and in some "corners" of the general society.

Currently, colleges and universities find themselves in a transitional period of anticipated change. The earmarks of this transition can be fairly easily identified. Uppermost among the "earmarks" are: changes in student mores, increased concerns for and about students, some concern about the quality of educational programs, the fact of a diverse student voice now being heard on different fronts, and the use of protest meetings and demonstrations. A major question, derived from these manifestations, seems to be whether or not the problems, the turmoil and the developments of the recent years can lead to significant program changes, to more meaningful education for the great variety of youth, and to important experiences which are no longer unrelated to the reality of existence and the major issues of our times.

The complacency of the educational scene in the middle and late Fifties has all but disappeared on most college campuses. Where all students in some institutions may still be unconcerned and uninvolved, it is doubtful that administrators and faculty have remained untouched by the student behavior in other settings. News media and national and regional conferences have brought the role and thinking of committed and "activist" students, of those participating in "the movement", on to center stage. And educators have been given cause to ask, at times with trepidation, what these new extra- and intramural "crusades" mean for all of higher education. Besides having brought some social ills under the bright lights, students have also given us cause to doubt that all parties in the educational enterprise are achieving their goals. They have also challenged any conclusions that the various facets of higher education in this nation are operating as intended, and that the centers of learning are propagating substantive knowledge while at the same time advancing mankind toward the benefits of a greater society.

Whether or not we ever really believed that we were accomplishing the laudable objectives of education, many professed this to be the case. Actually, the facts and evidence available have not lent themselves to such an interpretation.[1] Nor is such a conclusion supported by the increasingly audible student voice, - one of frustration, agitation and discontent. In this paper, the orientation and commitments of one sample of modern college students, participants in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, are examined from a couple of perspectives. A major guiding question underlying this study centered in the FSM students' quest for knowledge and potential for academic attainment.

THE COMMITTED MINORITY

Much of the serious student activity in recent years seems, in large part, to be related to the sit-ins first conducted by Negro youth in the South. Their confrontations with members of a society which they saw as maintaining an anachronistic establishment precipitated, or certainly encouraged, isolated protestations by Negroes and whites of college age in other scattered locations.

---

[1] Jacob, Philip E., Changing Values in College, New York, Harper, 1957

Heist, Paul, "Higher Education and Human Potentialities." Chapter in Explorations in Human Potentialities, (Herbert A. Otto, Ed.), Chicago, Charles C. Thomas, 1965

Plant, W.T.: Personality Changes Associated With a College Education, San Jose, Calif., San Jose State College, (Final report, U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Branch Project 348), 1962.

The knowledgeable reader is probably aware of a considerable increase of intramural and extramural activity on a growing number of campuses, different in nature from the spirited "play" activity generally typical of college youth. He may be less cognizant that mild protests, questioning of traditional regulations, and even strong political advocacy have erupted since 1960 on some campuses where they would have been least expected. The fact that a few institutions have had a fairly continuous manifestation of such student activity and involvement, often centered in social problems or political issues, is not generally known. On several campuses in the United States, conflict and a degree of turmoil seem to be taken as a matter of course; these may even be defended as part of the "design" of an effective educational program.

The truth is that the colleges or universities which witness considerable and frequent student activity and committed support of off-campus causes tend to draw a student clientele that is measurably different from the student bodies in the great mass of institutions. In these schools a notable concentration of students of high ability and non-conservative values often tends to set a pattern for activism or some degree of protest. One fairly recent example is found in the colleges and universities which led other schools to join them in protesting the loyalty oaths required of students receiving NDEA loans, even to the point of refusing to administer the loans. Needless to say, a number of administrators and faculty members in these institutions supported students in this opposition to a national program.

In recent years several of the research projects at the Center for the Study of Higher Education have provided opportunities to look through the camouflaging ivy of a number of colleges and universities. Since these studies were conducted over the period of one student generation, it was possible to make fairly discerning appraisals of the activities of students and faculty.

Some of the findings have particular relevance to the underlying topic of this paper since these institutions varied greatly in the aptitude, intellect and commitment of their students.

The great differences in the measured ability of students are generally understood and need no elaboration. This has been the story also among the student bodies we have studied, where the average SAT scores have ranged over 80 percentile points. Of greater interest to us has been the amazing diversity found in the students' functional intellect and basic commitments. These differences are partially related to the variations in measured ability but probably as much to the religious background and family philosophy of a majority of students on these campuses.

The differences among students in their commitments or fundamental values need to be described as gradations on more than a single dimension. In other words, there are a number of personality characteristics which are relevant to academic activity and demand consideration. As one example, it has been revealing to find extreme variations on a complex characteristic of general intellectuality, that is, the degree of interest in the learning-reasoning process as well as in the world of ideas. A second important characteristic resulting in extensive differences among students, is that of general perception, which may be briefly explained as differences in the sensing of and reaction to the environment. The extremes in the perception dimension range from a broad, non-judgmental orientation to a tight, close-minded approach or reaction. A third example of a general characteristic in the area of basic commitments is an inner-versus other-directed orientation, where the essential differences are measured in a person's concern for the lives and

welfare of others.[2]

For example, among the colleges in which students have been surveyed and studied in several projects at the Berkeley Center, one or two schools had an over-abundance of intellectual, experience-seeking, and somewhat other-oriented youth. One college had a very large proportion of bright, semi-intellectual, but strongly other-oriented students. Some institutions had a great majority of average-ability, non-intellectual, conforming and somewhat egocentric students.

A number of pertinent findings about students in a variety of colleges are related to the present interest in the characteristics of students in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. An analysis of the FSM students will be prefaced, therefore, by a description of the leaders of quite different protest movements on three widely separated campuses. In the first college, (A), a student campaign was directed against the administration. In the other two cases, Colleges B and C, movements developed as opposition to existing social problems or issues in the larger community. The development in College A was an outgrowth of change in administrative policy which students saw as inimical to their best educational interests. In College B, students conducted a long campaign over months and years, on a segregation issue where the rights of

---

[2]These characteristics or orientations are measured in a number of ways and through various means by social scientists. The first of the three major characteristics listed, namely intellectual orientation, has been the one to receive considerable attention most recently. In the research over the past seven years at the Berkeley Center, these major characteristics and others have been assessed by a variety of scales included in the Omnibus Personality Inventory. This Inventory has been developed and used as a research instrument, chiefly to differentiate among students in various institutions and different major programs. Among the 12 scales encompassed in the Inventory, the names of those used in this investigation are the following: Thinking Introversion, Theoretical Orientation, Estheticism, Complexity, Autonomy, and Religious Liberalism. All six of these scales are used in a comprehensive assessment of a general intellectual disposition.

Negroes were presumably being curtailed. In the third college a group of upper classmen overcame opposition and general apathy and won out in their "mission" to organize a multi-college conference for the purpose of analyzing and criticizing our government's peace policy.

There appeared to be no strong faculty involvement or opposition in the initiation of these developments or movements. In the segregation case in College B the faculty in time became a source of major support. Real opposition to the students did come from the general public and larger community and eventually from governmental and police authorities. The project to organize a peace conference in the third institution did receive administration opposition and discouragement; much of the successful development was consequently "engineered" without the early sanction of any college authorities.

The outcome of these developments in the several colleges, as both students and neutral observers saw it, was success in the accomplishment of objectives. The administration, at College A, participated in a public "hearing" and respected the students' request to the extent of permitting a thorough examination of the issues. In the second school, problems of segregation were forcibly brought to the attention of the whole state and the students were credited with effecting the termination of an objectionable, discriminatory practice. In the last situation, College C, a series of excellent peace conferences resulted in succeeding years, following the accomplishments of the original student group.

Of relevance in this brief examination is not the fact of general and wide student body involvement, which occurred in each situation, nor the results of these spontaneous, extra-curricular activities. Rather, I wish to place emphasis on the general motivation and "personalities" of

the student bodies in the three colleges and on the characteristics of the key leadership groups. It is doubtful that over 5 per cent of American colleges and universities in the early 1960's could have been blessed or disrupted, depending on the reader's orientation, with constructive, persistent protests and especially with activities demanding leadership and broad student participation over weeks and months. Such developments, that is, rational protestations which persist over time, generally evolve unencouraged and unsanctioned. Consequently, they demand a concentration of students with a fair degree of intellect, who share a concern and are willing to take the risk and the valuable time to become personally involved in activity which will or cannot be rewarded or given recognition in the prescribed academic system. In fact, the contrary is closer to the truth in that the personal "pay-off" is as likely to be punishment or at least reprimand.

Let me focus briefly on one major ingredient of the particular activities on all three campuses - the matter of the spark, the initiative, and persistence of a leadership "group" in each case. The men and women who actually did play the forefront roles in these instances were identified, most of them were interviewed, and later a variety of available assessment data were analyzed. Across the three colleges, the key leaders or leadership groups comprised no more than eleven people. It was of considerable interest to examine whether or not these eleven were in some way special or different, especially within the context of three rather unique student bodies. What characteristics, if any, would distinguish them from their classmates and other peers? What composite of traits and attributes might have been basic to their motivation or willingness to take the stands they did or to provide the necessary initiative?

In somewhat summary fashion, it may be safely stated that these leaders, viewed as a group, were significantly brighter than the average students in the respective colleges, though at least three had SAT scores that would place them near the average (of their respective student body). They came from a diversity of homes and their fathers were in a variety of occupations. All eleven, however, came from homes where the religious affiliations were of a liberal nature or perhaps could be described as tenuous or unimportant. Over half of these students classified themselves as agnostics or non-religious as entering freshmen; two others were members of the American Friends Society; none of them were active or participative in a denominational group at the time of graduation. I hasten to add that, in a generic sense of the term, one might be in error to glibly describe them as non-religious. We came to know and to understand them as men and women who were morally concerned about numerous social and political topics and given to examining the ethical bases of their decisions and behavior.

A composite of characteristics which differentiated nine (out of eleven) from the general student bodies were as follows: the level of cultural sophistication, the degree of sensitivity and awareness, the extent of a libertarian orientation, the intensity or level of intellectual disposition, and the state of readiness to be involved or active in behavior beyond the campus norms. The other two could be differentiated on two or three of these traits. From a standpoint of observable activity, dress and style of life, only three or four, were ever classified as practicing non-conformists. By philosophy and general commitment, however, all would have to be seen as intellectual non-conformists, or as capable of taking this role when and if the occasion demanded.

In brief, at least nine or ten of these students were rather special and extraordinary. Though generally respected, they were understandably not always

appreciated on their own campuses; such individuals often provoke thought and responses in controversial areas in which many of their peers are unaccustomed to being personally involved. To end this brief account of these somewhat a-typical students, a look at their post-college academic records, activities and attainments will serve to round out the story. Nine are still pursuing a life of scholarship, which, incidentally, characterized their undergraduate days also. Six have finished or are completing their doctorate. Two will be entering their fourth year of medicine, one with the intention of pursuing a special research interest and the other with the idea of working with or for the World Health Organization, in the area of depressed and undeveloped countries.

SOME DYNAMICS OF THE FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT

The findings regarding aggressive student leadership, of the type just reviewed, provided some background and a little different perspective for observing the developments last fall of the highly publicized Free Speech Movement on the Berkeley campus. Having studied and interviewed atypical students in other settings over several years, and having talked with a number of committed, liberal students on the Berkeley campus during the same period, we could say, with something more than hindsight, that the Free Speech Movement never did appear to be as controversial, as threatening, or as flamboyant as they apparently were to certain segments of the immediate and the more remote society. On the contrary, during a discussion with two colleagues in late October, 1964, it was suggested that the students, especially those committed to ongoing social-action groups, were reacting quite predictably to the situation and the evolving circumstances in which they suddenly found themselves in September and thereafter.

At that time, we assumed that the small nucleus of presumably liberal youth who were or had been active in the Students Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, Congress on Racial Equality, Committee for Non-Violent Action, Young Democrats, and one or two other groups, some of whom had seen action in picket lines, was similar to the capable leaders and other bright and committed individuals we had come to know on other campuses. Consequently, some protests and a little of the sequence of events were anticipated. However, what information we did have on the Berkeley undergraduate population would have negated any predictions about the developments which occurred in the months to follow. In fact, there was little reason to believe, during the initial days of student reaction, that more than a small number of highly committed students, perhaps 50 to 100, existed within the large undergraduate population. And during the early weeks in October, our speculation centered mostly on the likelihood that a relatively small group could obtain a requested hearing with the administration

The continuing commentary is not intended as a defense of FSM. Its record and accomplishments seem to speak for themselves, at least for those who have attempted an objective appraisal or who have been willing to read discerningly. Instead, a brief examination will be made of available information about some of the major characteristics of the young men and women who initiated this campaign or participated in it.

In a sense, the Free Speech Movement provided an important window for many people on the Berkeley campus. For the faculty members who listened carefully it resulted in new insights to the diverse composition of the undergraduate and graduate population. It gave them some understanding of a potent proportion who were committed to tackling certain problems of society and mass education, and it fairly effectively introduced many to some of the reasons for dissatisfaction

among serious students at all levels. Gradual understanding of the movement and the participants may also have led to greater respect for many bright, "intellectuals" in the prominent nonconformist subculture, and also to a greater willingness to consider the characteristics, the desires, and needs of a scholarly minority on the campus. It should be mentioned that the so-called nonconformist and scholarly minorities are not exclusive categories, and such brief terms lead to an inadequate description in either case.

Early Hypotheses about Students in The Movement

Some time in November, after weeks of fluctuating developments and numerous unsatisfactory exchanges among administration, faculty and students, there appeared to be several bases for listing tentative hypotheses about the students participating in the controversy. These conjectures at that time were premised in part on the persistence of the movement, the observed composition of the growing numbers at noon rallies, and the content and quality of the speeches by the leaders and other participants. These early hypotheses were also encouraged by a review of the measured characteristics of thirteen participating graduate students who had been former subjects in research projects on other campuses. The information on this very small segment of the FSM was an "eye-opener" and the first evidence to support what had been surmised by some members of our Center staff.

Among the FSM constituency, to judge by these transfer students at the graduate level, there were some dedicated people who had established enviable records in undergraduate settings before coming to Berkeley. There were a few individuals in this small group who had earlier been identified as very exceptional students and two who had been rated as highly creative. A couple of others had gained previous recognition as campus leaders and activists.

All had come to Berkeley with sound undergraduate training in highly respected institutions and with a record of excellent grades. As intimated, the characteristics of these thirteen, as a group, as well as the knowledge of their records and backgrounds, intensified our interests in their present affiliation with FSM.

Thus, several off-the-cuff hypotheses were stated, premised on some data about a limited number of graduate students and the "conclusions" drawn after weeks of observation. This was done mostly to focus growing interest in another student campaign but also to promote discussion and continued analyses of a significant controversy. The several hypotheses were listed in the following order:

a) The persons participating in the FSM, as compared to the average or non-participating students:
   (1) are more autonomous and independent of their social-cultural past;
   (2) have stronger and broader intellectual dispositions;
   (3) are better students and obtain higher grade point averages.

b) The membership of the FSM is composed of a larger proportion of transfer students than of students who enrolled at Berkeley as entering freshmen.

c) A majority of the transfer students in the FSM come from selective liberal arts or private and public universities, (or, from a limited, sample of institutions in higher education).

Results of a Survey of a FSM Sample

Some months after first being stated the several hypotheses were used. The project or study was initiated only after we were "driven" to the task. Our chief motivation grew out of what was considered to be a fairly continuous misinterpretation of what the FSM meant and represented and the frequent derogative descriptions of the students involved. Interpretation and misinterpretation from the press is to be expected; in fact, varied and quite diverse explanations would necessarily be coordinate with most reporters' perception and general orientation (or that of a particular news agency). And the interpretations and understanding of most of the public were naturally based on what was seen or highlighted by the press and television.[3]

---

[3]These brief comments about the news coverage and the seemingly one-sided interpretation of the FSM are only part of the story about how the FSM leaders and students were perceived and received. The fact that much of the press diagnosed the activities day after day as essentially bad and non-constructive helped to "victimize" the majority of a reading public. One could count on the fingers of one hand the number of newspapers within the immediate geographical area and within the State which seemed to make any attempt to get the total story. Very few papers examined the developments from two or more perspectives or seriously inquired about the motivation or the apparently intense commitments of an expanding number of participants. In a few instances where a story or column presented an analysis of the students or reasons for their behavior, it was done with tongue in cheek or with an implication that these youth, though possibly bright and in the most selective university in the country, were sadly duped and misguided.

But, as already indicated, the reception that FSM activity received throughout the State and nation cannot be credited entirely to communications media. The students, in various ways, were not always the best agents of their cause; this was sensed and even examined by members of the Steering and Executive Committees. Though never riotous, in an excessive, physically aggressive way, and though resorting to protest only through numbers (when dialogue and verbal confrontation was not seen as successful), the FSM leaders would be the first to admit to some indiscretions and faulty moves. And the leaders were also not unconcerned about the problems of representing the thinking of a majority of the FSM constituents or of the mass of the student body. They were often torn between the necessity of considering the importance and immediacy of a next decision while not having sufficient time to adequately sound out the "members."

(cont'd footnote, p. 16)

It was the persistent lack of objectivity and the frequent unfairness in much reporting, especially where more of the facts could have been ascertained, that promoted a see-for-yourself policy. We felt obliged to discover whether selected characteristics of the students in the movement were in line with what we had surmised or whether they were more like the impressions and convictions of most of the public. Thus, a sample of students was surveyed approximately two months after the December 2nd arrests, to determine some of the motivational characteristics and the general academic calibre of FSM participants. The particular sample was drawn from the list of more than 800 persons arrested.[4] The cooperating students were asked to complete a biographical questionnaire and to respond to the items in an attitude inventory.

---

[3](cont'd) Obviously, such matters as the general attire, the beards, the long hair, the sandals, et cetera, of a percentage of the students were seen as negative and questionable to a public that has difficulty understanding any deviate phenomena. Behavior or events that are seen as different, and as a possible threat to the status quo, always pose problems to those who see them as such. The level of general tolerance is not high in most societies and our complex, multi-structured society tends to keep most forms of deviancy out of the mainstream. Thus, the nonconformity of the FSM students, particularly of those exhibiting uncommon styles of dress, put them immediately in the position of being judged rather than understood. And when once judged or categorized, it is difficult to be heard fairly or understood.

Among other aspects of the reception by the public are the following: the matter of a town-gown rivalry, with numerous pursuant contentions, on a statewide scale, exhibited in many accusations, such as "the Red Square in Berkeley" and "the taxpayers rat-hole;" the fact that youth should be obedient and respectful and not questioning the "system" or the adult world (prankish, mischievous, and maybe rebellious, but not rebellious at a rational, intellectual level); and the problem of being threatened by or fearful of intelligence, of persons who question present methods and expose the error of our ways.

---

[4] A 33 per cent sample of the arrested students were invited to participate in this additional survey of an already well-studied group. Since this survey was started at a time when the legal trials were also commencing, it was decided not to follow up on the first request to the total sample and to settle for whatever return was thus made available. The day after the letters of "invitation" were sent out the telephone-chain for the arrested students transmitted a message from their legal counsel warning the students about participation in a study of "this type" at the particular time. This advice was never counteracted by a later message over the next three weeks, however, approximately 50 per cent of the original sample asked for the materials and completed them.

In addition to surveying a sample of the students arrested on December 2nd, the two psychological instruments were also completed by a smaller sample of FSM participants whose cooperation had been solicited by those in the arrested sample. This resulted in a second group of approximately 60 participants (volunteers), who were not part of a random sample. A little over 30 per cent of these persons had also been arrested.

During this same period a sample of current (1964-65) seniors, selected at random from the directory, was also invited to complete the questionnaire and the inventory. This senior sample actually comprised a third reference or comparison group on which much identical information was available, the other two being an entering class at Berkeley some years back and a sample of seniors from the spring semester, 1963.

A little earlier another study of FSM members, most of whom were also arrested, had been completed by Watts and Whittaker on other aspects of commitment. The distribution of students participating in the Watts-Whittaker FSM group and in a cross-sectional control sample, as shown in Table 1, provide a mutual basis for some analysis of the representativeness of both FSM samples.[5] Judging by the information presented in Table 1, the combined FSM samples (N=188) in our survey appear to be fairly similar to the distribution in the Watts-Whittaker sample. But, in the study reported here, members of the sophomore class appear to be over-represented; and the smaller number of graduate students in both FSM samples (Watts-Whittaker and this one) is somewhat in line with the lower participating ratio at that level.

---

[5] Watts, William A., and Whittaker, David N.E., "Some Socio-Psychological Differences between Highly-Committed Members of the Free Speech Movement and the Student Population at Berkeley." (publication forthcoming in the Journal of Applied Behavioral Science.)

Table 1, on next page

The distribution across major programs, in the lower half of Table 1, is also generally consistent. The under-representation in FSM of students from three different major programs, namely Business, Earth Sciences, and Engineering, appears to be very similar for the two samples.

The representativeness of the cooperative students from our arrested sample was also checked against the non-respondents in the original 33 per cent drawn. This was done by comparing the averages of all grades received (cumulative GPA) by the end of the fall semester, at each class level (1964-65) and the proportions of both groups in the different major programs. The two distributions on the latter categories were very much alike, with the similar under-representation in the same three majors. On the GPA criterion only the non-responding freshmen had lower grades than their counterparts in the cooperating group.

Hypotheses b and c: the findings regarding the last two hypotheses stated above, one (b) suggesting that the majority of FSM participants were transfers and the other (c) that the transfers came mostly from a non-random sample of institutions, provides an appropriate introduction to the story about the participants' major characteristics. In the total FSM sample of 188, 49 per cent were transfers and 51 per cent had initially enrolled as Berkeley freshmen. If the freshmen who fell into this sample are not considered, the figures are slightly reversed, and we find that approximately 55 per cent of the remaining group were transfers. When the graduate sample (in which many transfers are to be expected) is also excluded the distribution is again a close 50-50 balance. Since the exact proportions of these two total groups

TABLE 2

AVERAGE STANDARD SCORES ON A SET OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS (SCALES) FOR VARIOUS SAMPLES OF STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (BERKELEY)

Scale Names	Entering Freshmen (2500+)	Senior Sample('63) (340)	Senior Sample ('65) (92)	FSM "Volunteer" Sample (58)	FSM "Arrested" Sample (130)	FSM Leader Sample (4)	FSM "Reliability" Sample (15)
Thinking Introversion	51	54	55	62	63	65	62
Theoretical Orientation	51	52	54	60	60	66	56
Estheticism	50	52	52	57	61	61	63
Complexity	51	53	54	63	66	67	65
Autonomy	51	55	61	68	67	68	68
Religious Liberalism	49	55	58	65	64	66	63
Impulse Expression	50	53	54	60	64	64	65
Social Alienation (SF)	50	46	47	48	52	51	53
Social Introversion	49	52	53	56	56	50	56
Lack of Anxiety	52	52	51	50	48	45	46
Response Bias	51	52	53	51	49	50	48

The midpoint of these standard score distributions is 50 which is equivalent to the average raw score on each scale for a large sample of college freshmen in the normative sample. The following standard score-percentile equivalents may help the reader who is unacquainted with standard scores: 50=50; 55=70; 60=84; 66=95; and 70=98.

on this campus cannot be determined, one can only conclude from these data that a large proportion of the participants had enrolled in the University after one or more years in other colleges and universities. Among the leaders who become most prominent and influential in the elected committees, transfer students were evident in significantly larger numbers. This is in line with the earlier speculation that the incoming Berkeley student body only had a minimal number who could serve in this kind of leadership capacity.

The results regarding the collegiate origins of the transfers were very much in agreement with the last hypothesis (c). Approximately 47 per cent had spent one or more undergraduate years in one of the better-known, selective liberal arts colleges or in private, "big image" universities. Another 15 per cent came from or through other well-known liberal arts institutions (mostly in the Eastern or Middle Western States), schools which are not quite as selective as the first group nor as productive of future scholars. An additional 32 per cent spent at least a semester at other University of California campuses or at highly respected, out-of-state public universities (e.g., Wisconsin, Michigan). And 10 per cent either started or spent some time in the New York City Colleges (e.g., CCNY, Queens, etc.). These backgrounds, together with the 7 per cent from foreign universities and 5 per cent from famous institutes of science and technology, would seem to indicate that the majority of transfer students in FSM did not come from the "rank-and-file" of American higher education. (The figures listed above total more than 100% since a proportion of FSM students had been in two or more previous institutions).

Table 2, on next page

As a check on the atypicality of the transfers in the FSM sample, the data on the small sample of seniors of 1965 provides some comparisons. Among these students who were getting their B.A. degree this past spring, 39 per cent were also transfers. However, only 3 of these students were from schools outside the State of California, and two of these institutions previously attended would fall into the first category mentioned in the previous paragraph, that is, selective liberal arts colleges. Most of these transfers in the senior sample came from other University campuses or from one of the state colleges or community colleges.

Hypotheses a-1,2,3: the question about the degree of autonomy and general independence of the FSM constituency, which was stated as part of the first hypothesis (a-1), resulted in a very positive answer. The evidence here is found in the combined results on three measured characteristics, all of which are scales in the attitude inventory (OPI) used in this survey.[6] The two larger FSM samples ("Volunteer" and "Arrested") listed in Table 2, whether singly or combined, were significantly higher (at the .01 level) than all reference groups on scales assessing the degree of autonomy, religious orientation and level of impulsivity. For example, the FSM average score on Autonomy is 67 or above as compared to 61 for the 1965 senior sample, and on Impulse Expression the respective scores are 64 and 58. These integrated results, especially when interpreted in light of the scores on several other scales, indicate a higher level of cultural sophistication, a greater release from the institutional influences of the past, and a greater openness and readiness to explore the world of knowledge and ideas. These scores also explain the FSM

---

[6] All the scales in the OPI-Form D are listed and briefly described in an appendix at the end of the article.

students' strong liberal orientation and perhaps, in part, explain why many support or work with organizations like YDA, CORE or SNCC. For the majority of these men and women, however, their libertarianism and social-political commitments are seen as largely secondary to their stronger disposition to be serious students and to pursue their academic goals.[7]

The latter point suggests the second part (a-2) of the first hypothesis, our particular interest in the students' intellectual disposition. The highly supportive evidence here can be drawn from the data in both Tables 2 and 3. In the first case, the difference in scores (again significant at the .01 level) on the first four scales (Table 2), between the two FSM samples and the reference groups, serves as the basis for describing a majority of these students as much more interested in several facets of intellectual activity than is true of the California freshmen and the students in the two senior samples.

The essence of these differences is portrayed in Table 3. Here the students are categorized by the degree of their intellectual disposition, which represents a complex index based on patterns of scores obtained on related scales[8]

---

[7]The two columns to the far right in Table 2 have been included for general interest. The data on the four leaders indicates that their orientation and motivation is much like the general FSM sample. The two exceptions, in line with the active roles they played, are the scores on the Theoretical Orientation and Social Introversion scales. The leaders are higher on the first and lower (more extroverted) on the latter.

The reliability sample is represented by a small group drawn at random from those who didn't cooperate initially but were in the original 33 per cent sample of arrested youth. They were asked the second time to serve as an anonymous reliability sample - as one means of checking on the non-respondents. Except for the scores on one scale they "look" very much like those in the other FSM groups.

---

[8]Thinking Introversion, Theoretical Orientation, Estheticism, Complexity, Autonomy, and Religious Liberalism.

This index or combined measure permits a rather expansive distribution of students across eight categories, extending from a high degree of intrinsic intellectual interests to a general rejection of what is often described as the life of the intellect.

Table 3, on next page

For the total FSM group we find almost 70 per cent in the top three categories and none in the bottom three, and it is to be remembered that a large proportion, in fact, the majority, of the FSM persons were freshmen, sophomores and juniors. The number of persons in these upper categories in the two senior samples amounts to 25 and 31 per cent. Consequently, the extent of a self-recruitment process of some form to FSM involvement seems very evident. The Free Speech Movement drew extraordinarily larger proportions of students with strong intellectual orientations, at all class levels (freshmen through graduate). Seemingly, a commitment to the causes and issues espoused by FSM and related activity, did not appeal to students of lesser or non-intellectual interests.

Regarding the remaining hypothesis (a-3), what about the academic achievement for these students? If one looks only at the cumulative grade points average after the fall semester, 1964-65, the semester of the continuous controversy, all FSM class subgroups in the undergraduate years have average GPA's above the University average. The seniors in the FSM, for example, achieved a significantly higher average GPA than the 1965 seniors in the reference sample The sophomores, juniors, and seniors, as three separate groups, received significantly higher average GPA's than is represented in the average GPA of the University. The graduate students in the Movement received grades at a level

TABLE

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS IN SEVERAL UCB SAMPLES AMONG EIGHT "INTELLECTUAL DISPOSITION" CATEGORIES
(Percentages)

Categories: (Degrees of Intellectual Disposition)	Entering Freshmen (2500*)	Senior Sample 1963 (340)	Senior Sample 1965 (92)	FSM Sample (188)
1. Broad, diverse interests with strong literary and esthetic perspectives *	0.6	1.8	3.0	18.0
2. Broad, intrinsic interests, oriented toward use of symbols and abstractions	4.4	6.7	6.0	26.0
3.	8.2	16.6	22.0	25.0
4.	15.3	19.7	26.0	17.0
5.	24.6	23.9	28.0	13.0
6.	32.6	21.3	8.0	.0
7. Limited or no intellectual interests; low receptivity to ideas or esthetics	9.5	4.8	4.0	.0
8. Oriented toward the pragmatic and concrete; essentially anti-intellectual	5.6	5.1	2.0	.0

*The definitions stated for the four extreme categories are somewhat arbitrary and included only to give an idea about the underlying "dimension." The definitions, however, are in line with the validation of this eight-category system.

equivalent to their non-participating colleagues but significantly above the graduate school average established over the years. Since many of the students recently interviewed state that their grades dropped for the 1964-65 fall term, the differences in favor of the FSM group could possibly be greater. In other words, the cumulative GPA's for many were quite likely somewhat lower because of the last semester's grades.

Thinking back over the variety of information reviewed, it is fair to conclude that the Berkeley students who gave much time, thought, and effort to the causes of the FSM, to the extent of being arrested and convicted, are a collection of unusual people, unusual chiefly in their positive deviation from most college student norms and from those norms of the presumably selected student body on the Berkeley campus. As a group, and though composed of a diverse mankind, they are unusual in their more ready concern about social problems and political issues, their intellectual awareness and need to be vitally involved in academic matters, and their exciting potential for scholarship and creative expression.

It would really not be hazarding a guess to say that a student body composed of the approximately 800 students who were arrested would provide a truly unique nucleus for a college or university. Fortunately, such a collection or assemblage has probably never before thronged the halls and classrooms of any single small liberal arts institution. I say "fortunately" for it is doubtful that a faculty could be assembled in one place to meet the challenge and responsibility, the serious expectations, the intense desires, and the genuine commitments. In the colleges studied in several projects at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, even the most selective schools have not drawn such a concentration of students at the apparent levels of intellect and commitment. Paradoxically, were such a student body ever to materialize, many members of a

faculty would be the last to recognize and accept the challenge.

SUMMARY

A few comments to effect a little integration and interpretation: In general, the FSM represented a type and quality of discontent which Plato would have appreciated; but such discontent will probably never plague more than a small handful of institutions on the higher educational scene. It is suggested that the necessary combination of a concentration of youth of intellect and commitment, in the context of a disturbing circumstance, be that local or extramural, will be limited to relatively few institutions. As it was expressed late in the fall semester of 1964 by a respected administrator in one of our rapidly growing academic kingdoms, speaking to his deans and fellow administrators: "I know we all feel we are fortunate that what is occurring in Berkeley is not happening here, but I am also sad when, with a tear in my eye, I admit to you that it could not happen here." For him the clustering of students with sufficient motivation and concern to create the Free Speech Movement was seen as an enviable though probably fortuitous situation.

One objective in this paper has been to suggest that the development of the FSM, with all the turmoil and agitation it represented, was secondary to the fact and to the existence of the students who made it possible, secondary also to what this sampling of students should mean for the major purposes of higher education. The FSM probably served - or should have served - a major function in introducing the Berkeley professoriate to a significant and highly potent minority. The chief nucleus for exceptional academic and scholastic promise on this campus was concentrated in a minority of youth who have been sentenced for pursuing the dictates of their principles and commitments. I believe that most of them well understood long before their arrests, the price they might pay for that privilege.

In the transitional state in modern higher education there seem to be healthy signs, including some activity and contributions from faculty and administrators, that we have broken our anchorage and fixations and that the sanctity of many traditions is open to scrutiny. The scattered minorities of exceptional youth, occasionally concentrated in a few institutions, encourage those of us in the college and university establishment not to be reluctant to re-examine the future course of education and not to overlook the relationship between education and the important problems and issues in the real world.

Students to be feared? Feared, indeed - but only as we fail to recognize their potentialities and fail to provide the meaningful education they seek.

APPENDIX

OMNIBUS PERSONALITY INVENTORY (FORM D)--BRIEF SCALE DESCRIPTIONS

Thinking Introversion (TI): Persons scoring high on this measure exhibit a liking for reflective thought, particularly of an abstract nature. They express interests in areas such as literature, philosophy, and history. Their thinking tends to be less dominated by objective conditions and generally accepted ideas than that of low scorers. The latter extroverts tend to evaluate ideas on the basis of their practical immediate application.

Theoretical Orientation (TO): This scale assesses the degree of interest in using scientific methods in thinking, including interest in science as such and in scientific activities. High scorers are generally more logical, rational and critical in their approach to problems than those scoring at the average or below.

Estheticism (Es): High scorers endorse statements indicating diverse interests in artistic matters and activities. The content of the statements extends beyond painting, sculpture, and music and includes interests in literature and dramatics.

Complexity (Co): This measure reflects an experimental orientation rather than a fixed way of viewing and organizing phenomena. High scorers are tolerant of ambiguities and uncertainties, are fond of novel situations and ideas, and are frequently aware of subtle variations in the environment. Most persons very high on this dimension prefer to deal with complexity, as opposed to simplicity, and seem disposed to seek out and to enjoy diversity and ambiguity.

Autonomy (Au): The characteristic measured is composed of non-authoritarian thinking and a need for independence. High scorers are sufficiently independent of authority, as traditionally imposed through social institutions, that they oppose infringements on the rights of individuals. They tend to be nonjudgmental and realistic.

Religious Liberalism (RL): The high scorers are skeptical of religious beliefs and practices and tend to reject most of them, especially those that are orthodox or fundamentalistic. Persons scoring around the mean and lower are indicating various degrees of belief in general and their subscription to specific tenets and dogma.

Impulse Expression (IE): This scale assesses the degree to which one is generally ready to express impulses and to seek gratification either in conscious thought or overt action. The high scorers value sensations, have an active imagination, and their thinking is often dominated by feelings and fantasies.

Social Alienation (SF): High scorers (above 70) exhibit some attitudes and behavior that characterize socially alienated persons. Along with frequent feelings of isolation, loneliness, and rejection, they may intentionally avoid most others and experience feelings of hostility and aggression.

Social Introversion (SI): High scorers withdraw from social contacts and responsibilities. They display little interest in people or in being with

them. The social extroverts (low scorers), on the other hand, seek social contacts and gain satisfaction from them.

Lack of Anxiety (LA): Persons scoring high on this measure indicate that they have few feelings or symptoms of anxiety and do not admit to being unduly nervous or worried. Low scorers admit to a variety of these kinds of symptoms and complaints.

Masculinity-Femininity (MF): This scale reflects some of the differences in attitudes and interests between college men and women. High scorers (masculine) deny interest in esthetic matters and admit to few feelings of anxiety and personal inadequacy. They also tend to be less socially oriented than low scorers and more interested in scientific matters.

Response Bias (RB): High scorers respond to a majority of the statements in this scale in a way which is typical of experimental subjects who are asked to make a good impression. The responses of low scorers are similar to those of subjects instructed to make a poor impression. Scores between 40 and 60 denote valid scores on other scales.